1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA ALEXANDRIA DIVISION
3	x
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, : Criminal Action No.: 1:16-cr-42
5	versus :
6	ARDIT FERIZI, : Thursday, March 31, 2022 :
7	Defendant. :
8	The above-entitled hearing was heard before the
9	Honorable Leonie M. Brinkema, United States District Judge. This proceeding commenced at 10:04 a.m.
10	<u>APPEARANCES:</u>
11	FOR THE GOVERNMENT: DANYA ATIYEH, ESQUIRE
12	JOSEPH ATTIAS, ESQUIRE MICHAEL GILL, ESQUIRE
13	OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY 2100 Jamieson Avenue
14	Alexandria, Virginia 22314 (703) 299-3700
15	
16	FOR THE DEFENDANT: ELIZABETH MULLIN, ESQUIRE CAROLINE PLATT, ESQUIRE
17	OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER 1650 King Street
18	Suite 500 Alexandria, Virginia 22314
19	(703) 600-0800
20	COMPUTERIZED TRANSCRIPTION OF STENOGRAPHIC NOTES
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	1

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Criminal Case 16-42, United 3 States of America versus Ardit Ferizi. 4 Would counsel please note their appearances for 5 the record. 6 MS. ATIYEH: Good morning, Your Honor. 7 Danya Atiyeh, Joseph Attias and Mike Gill on behalf of the 8 United States. 9 THE COURT: Good morning. 10 MS. MULLIN: Good morning, Your Honor. Elizabeth 11 Mullin and Caroline Platt on behalf of Ardit Ferizi. 12 THE COURT: All right. And I should tell you that 13 we have two members of Judge Alsup's staff who are listening 14 in on this proceeding via telephone because they're out on 15 the west coast, and I want counsel to be aware of that. All 16 right. 17 Well, we set this hearing today because I was 18 expecting to get some information from the Government as to 19 what happened in the California case, and I've not received 20 anything yet. 21 So, Ms. Atiyeh, do you want to tell me what's 22 going on? 2.3 MS. ATIYEH: I will do my best, Your Honor. 2.4 I -- I want to thank Your Honor for calling this hearing today, because it has put us in a position where we have 25

2.3

2.4

been able to speak with the Northern District of California and get answers that were perhaps more satisfying to our office than what we had before.

And, Your Honor, in your order, your initial

And, Your Honor, in your order, your initial question was asking the Government to provide a clear explanation as to how the decision was made to bring the California charges and why. And on that point, Your Honor, I -- I'm not sure that I have a fulsome answer for you.

We -- when those charges were filed, Your Honor, our office filed a notice in this court, and what we said in that notice was true then, and it's true today. We were not consulted, we had no information that these charges were going to be filed until after they already had been. We did not -- there was no back-and-forth. We had not communicated with them at all. These charges came as much of a surprise to us as they did to the Court and to counsel.

The AUSA in the Northern District of California who brought those charges was at the time the chief of their fraud unit in the San Francisco office. And since that time in -- at the end of this past year, so at the end of December of 2021, he left that office, left the Government, and went to private practice, and we haven't been able to get in touch with him to get his insights on what evidence he believed there was or what communications he might have had with FBI or anything. That, to us, is a black box at

```
this point, Your Honor, and I don't know that we have a way
 1
 2
     to get that information.
 3
               THE COURT: Well, has he completely gone off the
 4
            I mean, lawyers are lawyers. I assume he went to a
 5
    private firm?
 6
                            That's my understanding, Your Honor,
               MS. ATIYEH:
 7
    but they haven't been in touch with him at all.
 8
               THE COURT: All right.
 9
               MS. ATIYEH: At that point -- so at the beginning
10
     of January of this year, a new case team at NDCA came onto
11
     the case. And that -- that case team consisted of two
12
     AUSAs, and also a team I think of two attorneys from CCIPS,
13
     the Computer Crimes and Intellectual Property Section at
    Main Justice and, at that point, they began to assess the
14
15
    evidence in the case.
16
               And, Your Honor, I don't know the answer to what
17
     the discrepancy was, but when they looked at that evidence,
18
     they believed that they did not have sufficient evidence on
19
     the mens rea prong of four of the five charges.
20
               And this was something that developed between
21
     January, when I first got a call from them asking about
22
     discovery, because it appears that there had been a
2.3
     substantial amount of discovery from the prior case in EDVA
     that had never been reviewed by the NDCA office.
2.4
25
               So I got a call from the new AUSAs asking me to
```

```
1
    provide them with additional information, essentially.
 2
                And there was minimal communication between our
 3
     offices for the next several months until about a week or
 4
     two before this dismissal was filed when they did contact us
 5
     and said that they had conducted their own independent
 6
     review of the evidence, this new case team. They believed
 7
     that on four of the five counts, the evidence was
     insufficient as to mens rea.
 8
 9
               As to the fifth count, which I believe was the
10
     transfer of identification information count, they believed
11
     that the defendant's quidelines were commensurate with the
12
     length of time he had already served incarcerated pretrial,
13
     and they believed that in the interest of prosecutorial
     discretion, it was appropriate to dismiss all of the
14
15
     charges.
16
               THE COURT: Now, the evidence -- so what you're
17
     telling me is that in January of '22, this year --
18
               MS. ATIYEH: Yes, Your Honor.
19
               THE COURT: -- that your office provided more
20
     fulsome discovery to the California prosecutors?
21
               MS. ATIYEH: Yes, Your Honor.
22
               THE COURT: And I'm assuming -- because, as I
23
     recall, Mr. Ferizi was extensively debriefed, and I think
2.4
     that's actually in the defendant's papers when they were
25
    making -- because I've read the pleadings that were filed in
```

```
1
     California.
                 So I saw the motion talking about vindictive
 2
    prosecution, and it went extensively in the debriefings that
 3
     Ferizi provided back in 2016, 2017, 2018.
 4
               So, I mean, the Government -- and, you know, I'm
 5
    not, for the record, holding anybody in EDVA responsible for
 6
     what happened. Raj Parekh came to me as soon as you all
 7
     found out about it and was very, very upset about it.
 8
               But, you're still part of the Department of
 9
     Justice. The FBI is part of the Department of Justice.
10
     it certainly is pretty clear to me that there were other
11
    members of the Department of Justice who were dissatisfied
12
     with the decision that not only I made, but the Fourth
     Circuit by not granting a stay had also given a preliminary
13
14
     look at the situation and had also ruled that way.
15
               So this, in my view, was an attempt to do an
     end-run around two courts' decisions that there was no
16
17
     appropriate basis to stay the deportation of this -- release
18
     and deportation of this defendant. So it is very troubling
19
     what happened here.
20
               But, in any case, the defense team in California
21
    pointed out that almost all of the information that appeared
22
     to be involved in the allegations against the plaintiff --
2.3
     the defendant, were essentially known to the Government.
2.4
               I mean, the way in which this man had gone about
25
    hacking the data that he had, and, you know, if it were
                                                                6
```

```
1
     considered -- and the Government -- the defense points this
 2
     out in their opposition to some of your pleadings in this
 3
     case right now. If that information were considered so
 4
     significant, that is the data that still is in his computer,
 5
     it's inconceivable to me that measures would not have been
 6
     taken back in 2018 to get rid of it.
 7
               You know, on the record, and I said this in my
 8
     original order, the Kosovo authorities were fully
 9
     cooperative with the United States Government. There's no
10
     reason to believe that they would not have worked with the
11
     FBI in interviewing the brother, in getting those -- the
12
     computers, and getting rid of the data. That's not been
13
     done in this case, as far as I know.
14
               I mean, Kosovo helped get the defendant back from
15
    Malaysia, the extradition didn't take very long. I mean,
16
     some extraditions with some of our good allies like the UK
17
     can take years. It took a couple of months to have him
18
     extradited.
19
               The record also shows that while he was held in
20
     Kosovo, he was subjected to pretty significant misconduct.
21
     Several months. I'm not blaming the U.S. Government for
22
     that, but I'm just saying that Kosovo knows how to handle
23
     defendants if they're concerned about them. So it's a very,
2.4
     very troubling case.
25
               So you really don't know exactly why this case was
```

```
1
     dropped other than a re-evaluation of the evidence and a
 2
     decision by other prosecutors that there was not sufficient
 3
     evidence to go forward?
               MS. ATIYEH: That's -- I mean, that is accurate,
 4
 5
     Your Honor.
 6
               And I just want to address one thing that you
 7
     raised, which is what was or was not known about the
     allegations that underlie those charges prior to the charges
 8
 9
    being brought.
10
               My understanding -- and I was not involved in this
11
     case in 2018 when these proffers were going on. My
12
     understanding is that the information about what
13
    Mr. Ferizi -- whatever activity he undertook while he was
14
     incarcerated in Indiana, that that information came from a
15
     jailhouse informant of some sort. And I was aware -- even
16
     at the time of the filing of the original compassionate
17
     release response, I was aware that those allegations existed
18
     from that jailhouse informant. But that -- that was the
     limit of what our office knew at the time.
19
20
               THE COURT: And you didn't -- but that was not
21
    brought to my attention.
22
               MS. ATIYEH: It was not, Your Honor. And it was
2.3
    not because this jailhouse informant was, as I believe --
2.4
               THE COURT: Unreliable.
25
               MS. ATIYEH: -- the defense has alluded to, was
```

```
1
     known to be unreliable.
 2
               THE COURT: Yeah.
 3
               MS. ATIYEH: And I would not put that before Your
 4
     Honor because there was no additional information to
 5
     validate or verify it.
 6
               And so, at that point after Your Honor granted
 7
     compassionate release, it's my understanding that the FBI
 8
     decided that that would be a valid line of inquiry to
 9
     attempt to discover whether -- whether Mr. Ferizi had,
10
     indeed, engaged in some sort of illegal activity while he
11
     was incarcerated.
12
               And, at that point, they did follow-up interviews.
13
     They interviewed a number of other people. They, I suppose,
14
     went into the email accounts. It seems that that's the
15
    point at which they did that. And Your Honor may be right
16
     to say that that should have been done in 2018, but it
17
    wasn't.
               THE COURT: All right.
18
19
               MS. ATIYEH: Is there anything else I can answer
20
     for Your Honor? I know Your Honor wants to create a record
21
     on this, and I'm happy to answer any questions you have as
22
     far as what our office is aware of or what we know.
2.3
               THE COURT: Well, Ms. Mullin, I'm going to ask
     you.
24
25
               Are there any other issues or questions you would
```

```
1
     like the Court to put to the Government on this one?
 2
               MS. MULLIN: Court's indulgence.
 3
                               (Pause.)
 4
               MS. MULLIN: Your Honor, just a brief, I guess,
    response.
 5
 6
               This Court granted compassionate release on
 7
     December 3rd, 2020. And we have a 302 provided by the
 8
     Government in discovery in Mr. Ferizi's California case that
     indicates that on January -- I'm sorry. On December 29th,
 9
10
     2020, so after the compassionate release grant and after, I
11
     believe, this Court denied the Government's request for a
12
     stay, the FBI reached out to Ms. Atiyeh and asked for
13
    permission to access email accounts that were referenced in
14
    Mr. Ferizi's proffer session.
15
               So the Government in this -- this office knew that
16
     the FBI was initiating an investigation after this Court had
17
     granted compassionate release. And I think that's one of
18
     the arguments -- or I know that's one of the arguments that
19
    Mr. Ferizi's defense counsel made in his vindictive
20
    prosecution motion. That after this Court granted
21
     compassionate release and after Mr. Ferizi was set to be
22
     deported back to Kosovo, this office knew that the FBI was
23
     initiating another investigation into Mr. Ferizi based on
2.4
     information that the Government has had since 2018.
25
    prior to 2018, because Mr. Ferizi disclosed all of that
                                                                10
```

```
1
     during his proffer sessions.
 2
               So we agree with the Court's, I guess inclination
 3
     to think that this was an attempt to end-run the Court's --
 4
     the authority of the Court and of the Fourth Circuit.
 5
               THE COURT: All right. Ms. Atiyeh, there is
 6
     something else I want you to address, and I don't believe
 7
     that you actually were on the brief before the Fourth
     Circuit; is that correct?
 8
 9
               MS. ATIYEH: I was not, Your Honor. Mr. Attias is
10
     here if you need to address any specific questions about
11
     that.
12
               THE COURT: Well, the -- in your papers recently
13
     filed, you know, there was -- you sort of tried to downplay
14
     the emphasis on this new investigation and these new charges
15
     as being a -- something that, you know, you really pushed on
16
     the Fourth Circuit.
17
               But Ms. Mullin has come back and said that, you
18
     know, that's a disingenuous position because the information
19
     was clearly presented to the Fourth Circuit, and it's
20
     clearly the basis for the Fourth Circuit remand to this
21
     court, and that is troubling.
22
               But, in fact, why did you not, when you were
23
     contacted by the FBI, ask the Court at that point to
2.4
     reconsider its decision rather than wasting the Fourth
25
     Circuit's time?
                                                                11
```

1 MS. ATIYEH: Your Honor, I think -- I think the 2 answer to that is, is just the timeline. 3 I -- we were in a position where -- Ms. Mullin is 4 correct to say that I was aware that the FBI had begun an 5 investigation into these email addresses. But there was 6 just a gap in time there, Your Honor, where I was aware that 7 they were conducting an investigation, and then all of a 8 sudden there were new charges in California. 9 There was never a point at which FBI came to our office -- and I will tell Your Honor, to the extent that I 10 11 talked about this at all with FBI, I had told them it was 12 very unlikely that EDVA would have jurisdiction over any 13 charges resulting from that conduct. So perhaps that's why 14 they didn't come to our office. 15 But there was no point at which they came back to 16 our office and said that that investigation into the emails 17 had borne fruit. If they had, I think we would have gone 18 back to Your Honor with that information. It's just not how 19 it played out. 20 THE COURT: Well, what communications did you have 21 with the FBI after the Court granted the motion for 22 compassionate release? Because that was done -- you know, 23 there was one oral argument, and then I think it was just 2.4 done on the papers after that. Or did we have a second 25 argument? I can't recall whether you all --12

```
1
               MS. MULLIN: Your Honor, there was one oral
 2
     argument.
 3
               THE COURT: I'm sorry?
 4
               MS. MULLIN: There was one oral argument, and the
 5
     Court granted compassionate release on the papers on
 6
     December 3rd, 2020.
 7
               THE COURT: Right. All right. And the oral
     argument that we did have, because that was in the height of
 8
 9
     the COVID era, was, as I recall, remote. It was a telephone
10
     conference that we had.
11
               MS. ATIYEH: Yes, Your Honor.
12
               THE COURT: All right. So there were no FBI
13
     agents listening in on that conversation, on that hearing;
14
     correct?
15
               MS. ATIYEH: Correct, Your Honor.
16
               THE COURT: All right. So how did the -- what,
     it's an agent down in Florida become aware of what was going
17
18
     on?
               MS. ATIYEH: Well, Your Honor, the agent down in
19
20
     Florida was the original case agent on the case here. He
21
    was a WFO agent at the time, and he was following the case
22
     very closely. And he was the agent certainly who had
2.3
    provided me the limited information that we had about the
2.4
    accusations from the jailhouse informant that I determined
25
     at the time were not sufficiently substantiated to put into
```

```
1
     our response. So there had been some conversation.
 2
               After Your Honor granted the compassionate
 3
     release, I mean, there was -- as I'm sure you can
 4
     understand, there was substantial communication between our
 5
     office generally and FBI. They were upset, Your Honor.
 6
     They wanted to know if there was anything that could be
 7
     done.
 8
               And our office was focused on our appeal, Your
 9
    Honor. We -- we believed then, and our appeal was filed
10
     prior to the new California charges. That was always the
11
     focus of our office, regardless of whether it meant that
12
    Mr. Ferizi was going to get sent back to Kosovo in the
13
               Our focus was on pursuing the appeal.
     interim.
14
               THE COURT: And excuse me. When did the Fourth
     Circuit deny your request for a stay?
15
16
               MS. ATIYEH: I know that it was prior to the
17
     California charges.
18
               Do you know the date?
19
               MR. ATTIAS: I don't know the date, but it was
20
    prior to the charges.
21
               THE COURT: Uh-huh.
22
               MS. ATIYEH: There was -- you asked what other
23
     communication there was between our office and the FBI.
2.4
     There was a lot of discussion -- Your Honor, I can't say
25
     strongly enough that we were trying to uphold Your Honor's
```

1 We were communicating with FBI to try to coordinate 2 with ICE because FBI had Mr. Ferizi's travel documents. 3 There was a substantial amount of communication about 4 finding his passport, his travel documents in the FBI 5 evidence rooms and getting them to ICE so we could effect 6 Your Honor's order. 7 There was discussion of FBI conducting some sort of interview with him before he was deported. There was 8 9 discussion with FBI about whether it was possible to get him 10 a vaccine to further effectuate Your Honor's order. Because 11 at the time you'll recall, this was -- this was in January 12 of 2021. Vaccines had become available but not widely so. 13 And ICE was very concerned about their ability to 14 get Mr. Ferizi back to Kosovo, because he would have had to 15 pass through a third-party country. Apparently there were 16 no direct flights, and they were concerned that a 17 third-party country would be unwilling to take him without 18 either a vaccine or a lengthy quarantine period. 19 There was a fairly substantial amount of 20 discussion about all of this against the background of my 21 understanding is FBI continuing to pursue this investigation 22 that our office was largely remote from. And I don't know 2.3 the reason for that, other than, as I said earlier, Your 2.4 Honor, that we told them if this was conduct that occurred 25 while he was incarcerated in Indiana, our district is 15

1

2

4

```
unlikely to have jurisdiction. And so presumably they were
     working with AUSAs in other districts. I had assumed they
 3
     would have been working in Indiana, so I was particularly
     surprised by California charges, Your Honor.
 5
               THE COURT: Yeah. Maybe Indiana didn't want to
 6
     touch it.
 7
               MS. ATIYEH: That's entirely possible, Your Honor.
 8
     I don't know.
 9
               THE COURT: All right. Well, I will tell you,
10
     I -- I mulled around in chambers whether I was going to file
     a referral to the Inspector General for DOJ, because I
11
12
     thought what happened here was really very troubling in that
13
     it evidenced to me a mindset that two different courts
14
    having granted -- or decided that there was no basis to stay
15
     this man's deportation, it didn't sit well with the powers
16
     that be, and so they were going to do an end-run around it.
17
     Very troubling. This is not a good record.
18
               At the same time, I decided that rather than
19
    making such a firestorm, I would simply handle the case the
20
     way I'm going to handle it today.
21
               I know that the remand -- and I know that you've
22
     argued that in the remand the Fourth Circuit indicated the
2.3
     Court should consider other factors than these charges,
2.4
     which I think are an absolute nullity at this point. I
25
     don't believe there's any sufficient evidence of any
                                                               16
```

misconduct while this man was in custody.

2.3

2.4

Again, I cited in the original opinion that the BOP still -- and I guess they were somewhat aware of the FBI's interest in Mr. Ferizi, still ranked him as low in terms of the danger that he poses. They took him from Terre Haute and put him to the lower level -- not a low level, but to the medium facility. They ratcheted down the level of his incarceration. And I think the way he's been treated and the fact that he's spent more than a year of additional time in custody because of what happened here is appalling.

You know, the biggest danger this country has to its stability and not necessarily from ISIS and outside sources; it's more internal. And especially if our own law enforcement people are not willing to respect and comply with the law and decisions of the Court and do it in the proper fashion, I think that's more insidious and more dangerous ultimately than these attacks from outsiders. So this is a bad case, and I'm considering that in the reasons for my decision.

But I am going to reaffirm my decision that

Mr. Ferizi is entitled to compassionate release. The

argument that there's been a change -- a material change in

condition in terms of COVID I think is not a good one.

Number 1, this man does have, and the Government's admitted it, that he has medical conditions that make him

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

particularly susceptible to and vulnerable to the virus, should he contract it. And we know that B.2 is beginning a resurgence of potential problems. Just today, I believe, the CDC has now announced that they're recommending a second booster for vulnerable populations. The president got a shot I believe this morning or yesterday. I heard on the news this morning that Shanghai is now being shut down by the Chinese government because they are having a resurgence of COVID infections in that part of the world. Europe is undergoing significant resurgence. And we all know that prison populations are not safe. So I think nothing in my view has changed. anything, the record has gotten nastier in this case. And as I said before, I think Kosovo is able to adequately work with the FBI if they believe that any misconduct is going on with this man. He'll clearly be on their radar screen. And he is -- as I said in my previous order, he still is under ten years of supervised release. If he gets involved in rehacking or doing something that violates U.S. law, the United States Government has a long reach, and you've got obviously good relationships with Kosovo. So there's no reason to believe that he can't be brought back here if he starts to hack into American databases or starting to use American identities in some sort of nefarious conduct.

```
1
               So I don't think that, in this case, there is the
 2
     kind of risk to the public that would otherwise be the case.
 3
     I don't find that any of the information that's been brought
 4
     to my attention makes a material difference to my decision
 5
     that this man is an appropriate candidate for compassionate
 6
               So I am, today, reinstating that order, which
 7
    means the Government can go forward if it still wishes to
     appeal that, that's fine.
 8
 9
               My understanding is that Judge Alsup had ordered
10
     the defendant to be placed into ICE custody. He, I believe,
11
     stayed execution of that order for one week, which I think
12
     probably has now elapsed. But I am going to direct that he
13
    be turned over to ICE custody. I am assuming that the FBI
     did find his passport and that there are no other actions by
14
15
     the FBI that would be holding up his deportation.
16
               MS. ATIYEH: Yes, Your Honor. That's correct.
17
               THE COURT: All right. And so I will add to my
18
     order that he is to be expeditiously removed from the United
19
     States. All right.
20
               Obviously I'm not going to grant a stay, in case
21
     you were planning to request that. So your next step is, as
22
     Judge Lewis used to say, invoke the rule of 95 and go down
2.3
     to Richmond if you want to continue pursuing this issue.
2.4
    All right?
25
               MS. ATIYEH: Yes, Your Honor.
                                                               19
```

```
1
               THE COURT: Is there anything further? Defense
 2
     counsel didn't get much of a chance to say much.
 3
               Ms. Mullin, did you want to put anything on the
 4
     record?
 5
               MS. MULLIN: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
 6
               THE COURT: Have you been in contact -- just for
 7
    my information -- come up to the lecturn.
 8
               Have you been in contact with Mr. Ferizi at all?
               MS. MULLIN: Not directly. Through his California
 9
10
     attorney.
11
               THE COURT: And how is he doing?
12
              MS. MULLIN: He's -- he's doing okay. We've been
13
     in contact with his family, actually, his mother. And she's
14
     eagerly awaiting his return. But he's doing okay. Thank
15
     you, Your Honor.
16
               THE COURT: All right. All right. That's fine.
17
               All right. Is there anything further on this
18
     case?
19
              MS. MULLIN: No, Your Honor.
20
              MS. ATIYEH: Nothing from the Government, Your
21
    Honor.
22
               THE COURT: All right. The last thing I'll say to
23
     the Government is, you know, you're still responsible for
2.4
     watching your agents. One of the toughest jobs a good AUSA
25
    has is sometimes riding herd on the agents that work for
                                                               20
```

```
1
     all. And, you know, that same problem comes to haunt
 2
    prosecutors with discovery.
 3
               You're the officer in court, and you represent the
     United States Government. And if you've got an FBI agent
 4
 5
     working behind the scenes who's not playing by the rules,
 6
     ultimately it comes back to bite the AUSA or the AUSA's
 7
     office; all right?
               So, going forward -- I recognize there's a great
 8
     deal of intense feelings, especially about these types of
 9
10
     cases, but that doesn't trump the requirement that the rules
11
    be followed; all right?
12
               MS. ATIYEH: Your Honor, I wholeheartedly agree,
13
     and I think there may be some conversations going on behind
     the scenes as to that issue.
14
15
               THE COURT: I would hope so. Thank you.
16
               MS. ATIYEH: Yes.
17
               THE COURT: We'll recess court for the day.
18
              MS. ATIYEH: Thank you, Your Honor.
19
                (Proceedings adjourned at 10:30 a.m.)
20
21
     I certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate
22
     transcription of my stenographic notes.
2.3
                                   Stephanie Austin
2.4
                                  Stephanie M. Austin, RPR, CRR
25
```